



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,288	03/23/2006	Jordi Tormo i Blasco	5000-0156PUS1	9407
2292	7590	05/17/2007	EXAMINER	
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH PO BOX 747 FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747				QAZI, SABIHA NAIM
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1616				
NOTIFICATION DATE			DELIVERY MODE	
05/17/2007			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/573,288	BLASCO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sabiha Qazi	1616	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 February 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

Final Office Action

Claims 1-20 are pending. No claim is allowed at this time.

Summary of this Office Action

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 102(b) Rejection
5. 35 USC § 103(a) Rejection
6. Response to Remarks
7. Conclusion
8. Communication

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other copending United States applications, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc., 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

35 USC § 102(b) Rejection

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by COTTER et al, EP 988,790. See abstract and claims. The reference discloses synergistic fungicidal combination of azolopyrimidines and quinoxyfen, which has been presently claimed.

See example 15 where fungicidal mixture of azolopyrimidine and quinoxyfen against *Puccinia recondite* on wheat is disclosed. The mixture shows synergistic results. The data disclosed in Table XV on page 16 are the observed and expected efficacy with different rates.

See example 16 where fungicidal mixture of azolopyrimidine and quinoxyfen against *Blumeria graminis* on wheat is disclosed. The mixture

shows synergistic results. The data disclosed in Table XVI on page 17 are the observed and expected efficacy with different rates.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Art Unit: 1616

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1-20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over COTTER et al., EP 988,790. The reference teaches synergistic fungicidal mixtures of triazolopyrimidine and quinoxifen which embraces Applicant's claimed invention. See the entire document especially abstract, examples 15 and 16, and claims.

Instant claims differ from the reference in one specific combination.

It had been decided by Courts that the indiscriminate selection of "some" from among "many" is considered prima facie obvious. In re Lemin, 141 USPQ 814 (1964); National Distillers and Chem. Corp. V. Brenner, 156 USPQ 163.

The instant claimed compounds would have been obvious because one skilled in the art would have been motivated to prepare a synergistically effective fungicidal mixture of triazolopyrimidine and quinoxifen embraced by the genus of the above cited reference with the expectation of obtaining additional beneficial fungicidal mixture. The instant claimed invention would have been suggested to one skilled in the art.

Because of each compound appears to be well known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination of the compounds would have been obvious in

Art Unit: 1616

view of MPEP 2144.06 and see *Ex parte Quadranti*, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).

See Ex parte Quadranti where it was held that

"Use of materials in combination, each of which is known to function for intended purpose, is generally held to be *prima facie* obvious, and in instant case, use of combination of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken by official notice; generalizations such as Colby formula are not particularly useful in determining whether synergism has been demonstrated, since formula inherently results in expectation of less than additive effect for combination of herbicides, since there is no evidence that such approach is considered valid by significant number of ordinarily skilled workers in relevant area of technology, and since it could be reasonably argued that in most cases, additive or better than additive results could be expected for combination of herbicides."

"There is no single, appropriate test for determining whether synergism has been demonstrated for chemical combination; rather, facts shown in each case must be analyzed to determine whether chosen method has clearly and convincingly demonstrated existence of synergism or unobvious result".

"Assuming arguendo that the differences in values presented are statistically significant, there is no evidence that they represent a true, practical advantage. In re Freeman, 474 F.2d 1318, 177 USPQ 139 (CCPA 1973); In re Klosak , 455 F.2d 1077, 173 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1972); In re D'Ancicco, 439 F.2d 1244, 169 USPQ 303 (CCPA 1971). Also, prescinding from the Colby formula test, which as we have already indicated is at best controversial and in our view probably invalid, there is no evidence that the differences are unexpected. In re Merck, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986); In re Longi , 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Freeman, *supra*".

One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the claimed compounds from the genus in the reference since such mixtures would have been suggested by the reference as a whole. It has been held that a

Art Unit: 1616

prior art disclosed genus of useful synergistic mixtures is sufficient to render prima facie obvious a species falling within the genus. In re Susi, 440 F.2d 442, 445, 169 USPQ 423, 425 (CCPA 1971), followed by the Federal Circuit in Merck & Co. V. Biocraft Laboratories, 874 F.2d 804, 10 USPQ 2d 1843, 1846 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

In claim 5 compounds I and II can be used jointly or separated or in succession, than how the synergism will be maintained.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have obvious to one skilled in the art.

Response to Remarks

- Arguments were fully considered but are not found persuasive therefore rejections are maintained. Since each compound appears to be well known in the prior art, it would appear that the combination of the compounds would have been obvious in view of MPEP 2144.06 and see Ex parte Quadranti, 25 USPQ2d 1071 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992).
- See Ex parte Quadranti where it was held that "There is no single, appropriate test for determining whether synergism has been demonstrated for chemical combination; rather, facts shown in each case

Art Unit: 1616

must be analyzed to determine whether chosen method has clearly and convincingly demonstrated existence of synergism or unobvious result".

- "Use of materials in combination, each of which is known to function for intended purpose, is generally held to be *prima facie* obvious, and in instant case, use of combination of herbicides is so notoriously well known as to be capable of being taken by official notice; generalizations such as Colby formula are not particularly useful in determining whether synergism has been demonstrated, since formula inherently results in expectation of less than additive effect for combination of herbicides, since there is no evidence that such approach is considered valid by significant number of ordinarily skilled workers in relevant area of technology, and since it could be reasonably argued that in most cases, additive or better than additive results could be expected for combination of herbicides."
- "Assuming arguendo that the differences in values presented are statistically significant, there is no evidence that they represent a true, practical advantage. *In re Freeman*, 474 F.2d 1318, 177 USPQ 139 (CCPA 1973); *In re Klosak* , 455 F.2d 1077, 173 USPQ 14 (CCPA 1972); *In re D'Ancicco*, 439 F.2d 1244, 169 USPQ 303 (CCPA 1971). Also, prescinding from the Colby formula test, which as we have already

indicated is at best controversial and in our view probably invalid, there is no evidence that the differences are unexpected. In re Merck, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.Cir. 1986); In re Longi , 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed.Cir. 1985); In re Freeman, *supra*" .

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone

Art Unit: 1616

number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER